quinn emanuel trial lawyers | new york

51 Madison Avenue, 22nd Floor, New York, New York 10010-1601 | TEL (212) 849-7000 FAX (212) 849-7100

WRITER'S DIRECT DIAL NO. (212) 849-7444

WRITER'S EMAIL ADDRESS robertloigman@quinnemanuel.com

August 18, 2020

VIA E-MAIL

FURMAN NYSDCHAMBERS@NYSD.USCOURTS.GOV

Hon. Jesse M. Furman United States District Court for the Southern District of New York Thurgood Marshall United States Courthouse 40 Foley Square New York, NY 10007

Re: Citibank, N.A. v. Brigade Capital Management, LP, No. 1:20-cv-06539

Dear Judge Furman:

We represent Brigade Capital Management, LP ("Brigade"), the defendant in this action. Brigade does not attempt here to respond to Citibank's various assertions in its letter to the Court because the controlling case law is clear and the Court did not invite any replies.

To the extent the Court accepts Citibank's late submission, Citibank's various factual assertions, which are both unsupported by admissible evidence and factually wrong, should not be considered. Additionally, Citibank's new argument that constructive knowledge is sufficient to defeat application of the "discharge for value" doctrine is wrong. For example, in *Regatos v. North Fork Bank*, 5 N.Y.3d 395 (2005), the New York Court of Appeals answered the Second Circuit's certified question, "In the absence of agreement, does New York U.C.C. Article 4–A"—the express provision relied upon by Citibank in its reply—"require actual notice, rather than merely constructive notice?" *Id.* at 400-01. The Court held that constructive notice was plainly insufficient as to the dispute between bank and accountholder over unauthorized payments, explaining, "Policy arguments support an actual notice requirement. An invariable statutory rule provides a bright line for banks and their customers, bringing reliability and certainty to these dealings." *Id.* at 405.

Respectfully submitted, /s/ Robert S. Loigman
Robert S. Loigman

Cc: Matthew D. Ingber, Esq. Christopher J. Houpt, Esq.